

### REMARKS

#### Claims 1-7

Claim 1 is an independent claim, from which claims 2-7 ultimately depend. Claims 2 and 4-7 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews (2002/0133678) in view of Sandstrom (2001/0013090). Claim 3 has been objected to as containing allowable subject matter, and which would be allowed if rewritten in independent form, including the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 3 directly depends from independent claim 1.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to at least substantially recite the subject matter of claim 1, and has cancelled claim 3. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 1, and claims 2 and 4-7 that depend therefrom, are allowable.

#### Claims 8-9

Claim 8 is an independent claim, from which claim 9 depends. Claims 8 and 9 have been allowed.

#### Claims 10-13

Claim 10 is an independent claim, from which claims 11-13 ultimately depend. Claims 10-13 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in view of Sandstrom. Applicant has amended claim 10 to at least substantially include the limitations of objected-to claim 3, which has been indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 10, and claims 11-13 that depend therefrom, are allowable.

Claim 14

Claim 14 is an independent claim, and has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in view of Sandstrom. Applicant has amended claim 14 to at least substantially include the limitations of objected-to claim 3, which has been indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 14 is allowable.

Claims 15-16

Claim 15 is an independent claim, from which claim 16 ultimately depends. Claims 15-16 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in view of Sandstrom. Applicant has amended claim 15 to at least substantially include the limitations of objected-to claim 3, which has been indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 15, and claim 16 that depends therefrom, are allowable.

Claim 17

Claim 17 is an independent claim, and has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in view of Sandstrom. Applicant has amended claim 17 to at least substantially include the limitations of objected-to claim 3, which has been indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 17 is allowable.

Claim 18

Claim 18 is an independent claim, and has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in view of Sandstrom. Applicant has amended claim 18 to at least substantially include the limitations of objected-to claim 3, which has been indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 18 is allowable.

Conclusion

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the pending claims in condition for allowance, and request that they so be allowed. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Mike Dryja, Applicants' Attorney, at 425-427-5094, so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. For these reasons, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



October 31, 2006  
Date

Michael A. Dryja, Reg. No. 39,662  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Law Offices of Michael Dryja  
704 228<sup>th</sup> Ave NE #694  
Sammamish, WA 98074  
tel: 425-427-5094  
fax: 206-374-2819